



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/617,906	07/17/2000	Kazuhiro Minami	JP9-1999-0152US1	7371

25259 7590 01/30/2004

IBM CORPORATION
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/617,906

Applicant(s)

MINAMI ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan D. Schlaifer

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3,5,6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application 09/617,906 filed on 07/17/2000, with prior art filed on 7/17/2000, 5/23/2002, and 11/07/2003.
2. Claims 1-11 are pending in the case. Claims 1-11 are independent claims.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the Abstract, on line 32, "is set" should be "are set". Also, on line 40, "generate" should be "generating". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. **Claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Ferrel et al. (USPN 5,860,073—filing date 7/17/1995), hereinafter Ferrel.**
5. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Ferrel discloses in the Abstract a display-information deciding method, executed by a display-information deciding apparatus, for transmitting display-information to an information terminal having a display screen and an input unit (the stylesheets operate on systems with displays and input units, as portrayed in Figure 2) comprising the steps of: a) analyzing a page template specified by a display-information obtaining request sent from the information terminal (in col. 3, lines 55-67, there is an electronic publishing system which analyzes a stylesheet); b) obtaining

display-area specifying information and display attribute information from said page template (in order for a stylesheet to operate on a display as in col. 3, lines 38-45, it inherently must include display information); c) obtaining a plurality of pieces of content specifying information related to said display-area specifying information (in col. 3, lines 45-53, pieces of information are processed with respect to the stylesheet); d) inspecting a plurality of display conditions respectively related to each of said pieces of content specifying information to determine whether each displaying condition has a content to be embedded in said page template; (in col. 3, lines 45-53, pieces of information are processed with respect to the stylesheet) e) shaping at least one content determined to be a content to be embedded in said page template in accordance with said display attribute information (in col. 3, lines 45-53, pieces of information are processed with respect to the stylesheet; this limitation is necessary to transform in accordance with the stylesheet); and f) transmitting said at least one shaped content to the information terminal (the stylesheet transmits its output to a viewer).

6. **Regarding independent claim 3**, Ferrel discloses in the Abstract a display-information deciding method, executed by a display-information deciding apparatus, for transmitting display-information to an information terminal having a display screen and an input unit (the stylesheets operate on systems with displays and input units, as portrayed in Figure 2) comprising the steps of: a) analyzing a page template specified by a display-information obtaining request sent from the information terminal (in col. 3, lines 55-67, there is an electronic publishing system which analyzes a stylesheet); b) obtaining display-area specifying information and display attribute information from said page

template (in order for a stylesheet to operate on a display as in col. 3, lines 38-45, it inherently must include display information); c) obtaining a plurality of pieces of content specifying information related to said display-area specifying information (in col. 3, lines 45-53, pieces of information are processed with respect to the stylesheet); d) inspecting a plurality of display conditions respectively related to each of said pieces of content specifying information to determine whether each displaying condition has a content to be embedded in said page template; (in col. 3, lines 45-53, pieces of information are processed with respect to the stylesheet) e) transmitting said at least one shaped content judged as a content to be embedded in said page template to the information terminal (the stylesheet transmits its output to a viewer).

7. **Regarding independent claim 7**, it is a storage medium that stores a program for performing the method of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.
8. **Regarding independent claim 9**, it is a storage medium that stores a program for performing the method of claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel, further in view of Davis et al. (USPN 5,796,952—filing date 3/21/1997).**

10. **Regarding independent claim 2**, Ferrel discloses in the Abstract a display-information deciding method, executed by a display-information deciding apparatus, for transmitting display-information to an information terminal having a display screen and an input unit (the stylesheets operate on systems with displays and input units, as portrayed in Figure 2) comprising the steps of: a) analyzing a page template specified by a display-information obtaining request sent from the information terminal (in col. 3, lines 55-67, there is an electronic publishing system which analyzes a stylesheet); b) obtaining display-area specifying information and display attribute information from said page template (in order for a stylesheet to operate on a display as in col. 3, lines 38-45, it inherently must include display information), c) obtaining a plurality of pieces of content specifying information related to said display-area specifying information (in col. 3, lines 45-53, pieces of information are processed with respect to the stylesheet); d) inspecting a plurality of schedule conditions respectively related to each of said pieces of content specifying information to determine whether each displaying condition has a content to be embedded in said page template; (in col. 3, lines 45-53, pieces of information are processed with respect to the stylesheet, which must inherently manage schedule issues for content in order to successfully display disparate pieces of content concurrently), f) transmitting said at least one shaped content to the information terminal (the stylesheet transmits its output to a viewer). However, Ferrel fails to disclose that the pieces of content c) are banner beans, d) that schedule conditions are inspected to the banner beans, e) obtaining display-image specifying information and link-destination-URL specifying information from a banner bean judged as a bean including a banner to be embedded in

the page template, or f) that there is transmitted information corresponding to the link-destination-URL. However, Davis, in col. 15, lines 20-41 describes a banner bean, and describes advantages that it is easily configurable and robust. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used banner beans in combination with Ferrel's invention such that the pieces of content c) are banner beans, d) that schedule conditions are inspected to the banner beans, e) obtaining display-image specifying information and link-destination-URL specifying information from a banner bean judged as a bean including a banner to be embedded in the page template, or f) that there is transmitted information corresponding to the link-destination-URL because then the modification would have made the beans to be easily configurable and robust.

11. **Regarding independent claim 8**, it is a storage medium that stores a program for performing the method of claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale.
12. **Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel, further in view of Beauchamp et al. (USPN 6,621,505 B1—filing date 9/30/1998), hereinafter Beauchamp.**
13. **Regarding independent claim 4**, Ferrel discloses in the Abstract a display-information deciding method, executed by a display-information deciding apparatus, for transmitting display-information to an information terminal having a display screen and an input unit (the stylesheets operate on systems with displays and input units, as portrayed in Figure 2), but Ferrel fails to disclose a) defining a page-template bean for holding as a property information for specifying an HTML file, including a Servlet, defining section containing

display-area specifying information as a parameter, b) obtaining content specifying information from a part bean determined to be a part bean for holding content specifying information for specifying content of a part displayed in a display area as a property, c) setting schedule information serving as a condition for contents to be displayed in said display area to said part bean, and d) holding said part bean and display-area specifying information by relating said part bean and said display-area specifying information with each other. However, Beauchamp reveals the use of a template that operates in conjunction with a JavaBean (see col. 14, lines 45-47). Further, Beauchamp reveals that the invention involves a communications servlet that regulates HTML output in col. 19, lines 48-67. Thus, Beauchamp meets the limitations of the claim because the servlet operates in conjunction with a page-template bean, which must obtain content from a part bean to operate successfully, along with setting schedule information for the part, and since the bean is a template bean, it will be associated with the display-area. The advantage of this arrangement is that it provides for use of modular, easily modifiable software components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a template bean in conjunction with a servlet in the manner of Beauchamp because it would have provided for use of modular, easily modifiable software components.

14. **Regarding independent claim 10**, it is a storage medium that stores a program for performing the method of claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.
15. **Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel.**

16. **Regarding independent claim 5**, Ferrel discloses in the Abstract a display-information deciding method, executed by a display-information deciding apparatus, for transmitting display-information to an information terminal having a display screen and an input unit (the stylesheets operate on systems with displays and input units, as portrayed in Figure 2) comprising the steps of: a) analyzing a page template specified by a display-information obtaining request sent from the information terminal (in col. 3, lines 55-67, there is an electronic publishing system which analyzes a stylesheet); obtaining display-area specifying information and display attribute information from said page template (in order for a stylesheet to operate on a display as in col. 3, lines 38-45, it inherently must include display information); obtaining a plurality of pieces of content specifying information related to said display-area specifying information (in col. 3, lines 45-53, pieces of information are processed with respect to the stylesheet); and c) web server software for transmitting at least one content judged as a content to be embedded in said page template to the information terminal (in fig. 1, the system is revealed to operate in a network environment). However, Ferrel fails to disclose the use of a schedule engine for inspecting a plurality of display conditions respectively related to each of said pieces of content specifying information to determine whether each displaying condition has a content to be embedded in said page template. However, in col. 3, lines 45-53, pieces of information are processed with respect to the stylesheet, and it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that schedule engines may be use to arrange items which must operate concurrently, as with items in a stylesheet, in order prevent conflicts between disparate elements of complex systems. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a schedule engine with the elements of a stylesheet to prevent conflicts between disparate elements of a complex system.

17. **Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel, further in view of Beauchamp, and further in view of Rogers et al. (USPN 6,621,505 B1—filing date 9/30/1998), hereinafter Rogers.**
18. **Regarding independent claim 6,** Ferrel discloses in the Abstract a display-information deciding method, executed by a display-information deciding apparatus, for transmitting display-information to an information terminal having a display screen and an input unit (the stylesheets operate on systems with displays and input units, as portrayed in Figure 2), defining section containing display-area specifying information as a parameter, but Ferrel fails to disclose 1) response to an HTML file, including a Servlet defining section, and 2a) a component DB for storing a part bean holding content specifying information for specifying the content of a part displayed in a display area as a property, and 2b) an arrangement rule DB for storing an arrangement object for holding said part bean, the display- area specifying information and schedule information serving as a condition for said part bean to be displayed in said display area by relating said part bean, the display-area specifying information, and said schedule information with each other. However, Beauchamp reveals the use of a template that operates in conjunction with a JavaBean (see col. 14, lines 45-47). Further, Beauchamp reveals that the invention involves a communications servlet that regulates HTML output in col. 19, lines 48-67. Thus, Beauchamp meets the limitations of the claim because the servlet operates in conjunction

with a page-template bean, which must obtain content from a part bean to operate successfully, along with setting schedule information for the part, and since the bean is a template bean, it will be associated with the display-area. The advantage of this arrangement is that it provides for use of modular, easily modifiable software components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a template bean in conjunction with a servlet in the manner of Beauchamp because it provides for use of modular, easily modifiable software components. However, Rogers further discloses in the Abstract and col. 6, lines 1-13 the use of a plurality of databases to store and manage JavaBeans in order to allow web-based agents to access JavaBeans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store JavaBeans in databases in the manner of Rogers in order to allow web-based agents to access JavaBeans.

19. **Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, further in view of Ferrel, further in view of Beauchamp.**
20. **Regarding independent claim 11,** Davis, in col. 15, lines 20-41 describes a banner bean, and describes advantages that it is easily configurable and robust, such that it is a) a banner bean holding banner-display-image specifying information for specifying a display image of a banner displayed in a display area and banner-link-destination-URL specifying information for specifying a link destination URL of said banner as properties. Davis fails to disclose that is stored on a storage medium for storing an object to be accessed by a display-information deciding apparatus for transmitting the corresponding display information in response to a request for obtaining an HTML file including a

Servlet defining section containing display-area specifying information and display attribute information as parameters sent from an information terminal having a display screen and an input unit, comprising, and b) an arrangement object for holding said banner bean, the display-area specifying information, and schedule information serving as condition for said banner to be displayed in a display area by relating said banner bean, display-area specifying information, and said schedule information with each other.

However, Beauchamp reveals the use of a template that operates in conjunction with a JavaBean (see col. 14, lines 45-47). Further, Beauchamp reveals that the invention involves a communications servlet that regulates HTML output in col. 19, lines 48-67. Thus, Beauchamp meets the limitations of the claim because the servlet operates in conjunction with a page-template bean, which must obtain content from a part bean to operate successfully, along with setting schedule information for the part, and since the bean is a template bean, it will be associated with the display-area. The advantage of this arrangement is that it provides for use of modular, easily modifiable software components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a template bean in conjunction with a servlet in the manner of Beauchamp because it provides for use of modular, easily modifiable software components. Ferrel discloses in the Abstract a storage medium for storing an object to be accessed by a display-information deciding apparatus, executed by a display-information deciding apparatus, for transmitting display-information to an information terminal having a display screen and an input unit (the stylesheets operate on systems with displays and input units, as portrayed in Figure 2). This provides an interactive system

for a stylesheet to operate upon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an apparatus as in Ferrel because it would provide an interactive system for a stylesheet to operate upon.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 5,621,875 (filing date 10/26/1993)—Mason et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is 703-305-9777. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

JS


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER